DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 479 367 TM 035 166

AUTHOR	Anderson, Jonathan W.; Diddams, Margaret
TITLE	Teaching Nonparametric Statistics Using Student Instrumental Values.
PUB DATE	2003-08-00
NOTE	10p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association (Chicago, IL, August 2002).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*College Students; Electronic Mail; Higher Education; *Nonparametric Statistics; Research Methodology; *Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS	*Instrumental Values

ABSTRACT

Nonparametric statistics are often difficult to teach in introduction to statistics courses because of the lack of real-world examples. This study demonstrated how teachers can use differences in the rankings and ratings of undergraduate and graduate values to discuss: (1) ipsative and normative scaling; (2) uses of the Mann-Whitney U-test; and (3) the importance of statistical significance, protected t-tests, and effect sizes. Participants were 32 junior and senior undergraduates in a research methodology course and 29 first and second year doctoral students in an introduction to statistics course. They received an e-mail workbook that contained 20 instrumental values and were asked to rate them using a 5-point Likert-type scale. They also rated the importance of the values in their own lives and then returned the completed spreadsheets to the professor, who prepared the data for students to use in class to analyze the results of normative and ipsative data. Students were exposed to ordinal, ipsative scaling and the theoretical reasoning for its appropriateness. Students also saw how a combined data file is assembled. (Contains 1 table and 10 references.) (SLD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

Running head: Nonparametric Statistics Activity

Teaching Nonparametric Statistics Using Student Instrumental Values[1]

Jonathan W. Anderson BA

Margaret Diddams PhD[2]

Seattle Pacific University

3307 Third Avenue West

Seattle Washington 98119

ED 479 367

TM035166

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. Diddams

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

[1] Presented at Division 2 Society for the Teaching of Psychology – August 2002 APA Annual Convention, Chicago IL.

[2] APA Member

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Teaching Nonparametric Statistics Using Student Instrumental Values

Abstract

Non-parametric statistics are often difficult to teach in introduction to Statistics because of the lack of real-world examples. In this paper we demonstrate how teachers can use differences in the rankings and ratings of undergraduate and graduate values to discuss 1) ipsative and normative scaling; 2) uses of the Mann-Whitney U-test and 3) discuss the importance of statistical significance, protected t-tests and effect sizes.

Teaching Non-Parametric Statistics Using Student Instrumental Values

Nonparametric statistics are an important tool for analyzing ordinal data especially ipsative scaling associated with rank ordering. Nevertheless, there are few opportunities in introductory statistics and methodology courses for students to grapple with the differences between normative and ipsative scaling and their different statistical analysis, especially using the same construct. The purpose of this poster presentation is to demonstrate an activity for students to explore the theoretical and methodological issues that arise when using ipsative or normative scaling to measure personal values.

Values have been defined as "an enduring belief that a specific mode of conduct or end-state of existence is personally or socially preferable to an opposite or converse mode of conduct or end-state of existence" (Rokeach, 1973, p. 5). Mode of conduct values are known as *instrumental values* (e.g. honesty, accountability), while end-state of existence values are known as *terminal values* (e.g. a comfortable or meaningful life).

Value researchers have often been divided on their use of normative or ipsative methods in measuring values (Meglino & Ravlin, 1998). *Normative* methods typically use a Likert-type scale and rate values independently of each other, (cf. Reynolds & Jolly, 1980; Singleton & Chen, 1996). *Ipsative* methods typically use a rank order or forced choice format and assess preferences between different values (cf. Meglino, Ravlin, & Adkins, 1989).

This activity gave undergraduate and graduate students the opportunity to rate and rank their own instrumental values. It also gave them the opportunity to identify and

use different statistical methods to compare value importance between their two groups. Four goals were associated with this demonstration.

1. Give students the opportunity to work with ipsative scaling.
2. Discuss aligning scaling choices to construct operationalization.
3. Introduce students to the nonparametric Mann-Whitney U test using the students' values as the data set.
4. Compare statistical results of instrumental value differences between undergrad and graduate students using both normative and ipsative scaling.

Method

Participants

Participants were 32 junior and senior undergraduates in a research methodology course and 29 first and second year doctoral students in an introduction to statistics course.

Materials and procedure

Participants received an excel workbook through e-mail which contained 20 instrumental values (Golden, 2001). Half the undergraduates and graduate students were asked to first rate the values using a 5-point Likert type scale, ranging from 1 = very unimportant to 5= very important. Next they were asked to rank the importance of the values in their own life; 1= most important, 20=least important. The other half of the participants were asked to rank the values first followed by the ratings. Participants returned the completed excel spreadsheet to the professor who combined the data and prepared the data file for the students to use in class. See Table 1 for a list of the 20 values.

Results

Students used a protected t-test with a $p<.0025$ (.05/20) to analyze the results of the normative Likert-scaling between undergrad and graduate results. There were no significant differences between graduate and undergraduate values. It should be noted that even with a less stringent *p* value cut-off there would have been no significant mean differences. More importantly, the effect sizes, shown in Table 1, are very small, with program (undergraduate vs. graduate) accounting, on average for less than 3% of the variance in mean value differences.

Students used a Mann-Whitney U-test to analyze the ipsative data (Marascuilo & McSweeney, 1977). Before computing the tests, students calculated the sum and average ranking for one value by hand. Next, the Mann-Whitney U-tests were calculated with SPSS using a stringent $p<.0025$ for statistical significance.

Undergraduates ranked *Order* as a significantly more important value than Graduate students. In addition, there were several values that did not meet the stringent *p* value but exceeded Cohen's (1988) small effect size (r=.30). Graduate students ranked *competency* and *knowledge* as more important while undergraduates ranked *obedience and order* as more important. See Table 1 for mean scale and rank scores, t-tests, Mann-Whitney U tests, and effect sizes for both tests.

Discussion

There were several benefits to this activity for advanced undergraduates and first year graduate students. First, students were exposed to ordinal, ipsative scaling and the theoretical reasoning for its appropriateness. After completing the data set, students and the professor discussed the construct of values and the issues surrounding its

operationalization. Both normative and ipsative scaling have their strengths and weaknesses. Normative scaling allows for measuring higher order factors. However, because normative scores are rated independently of each other, they are vulnerable to social desirability bias such that there is a tendency for artificially inflated relationships (Edward, 1990; Meglino & Ravlin, 1998). Probably the most important advantage of ipsative procedures lies in the conceptualization of the nature of values. Theoretically, values are thought to be unconsciously hierarchically ranked and reflect standards of preference such that individuals typically choose among values to guide their decision-making and behavior. This makes ipsative scaling a good conceptualization of the value construct (Rokeach, 1979). On the other hand, ipsative scaling does not capture absolute differences between values.

Secondly, the students generated the data themselves, were exposed to counterbalancing in data collection and saw how a combined data file is put together. Next, students were able to work with the nonparametric Mann-Whitney U-test with data that they generated. Fourth, students worked with protected *p* values and experienced the cost for adding variables to a data set. Fifth, the activity was a great discussion point for the different role and importance of statistical significance and effect sizes. Finally, the results generated good discussions with the graduate students on their expectations for their early graduate courses compared to their undergraduate courses and the usefulness of empirical data to shape that discussion.

References

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences 2nd Ed.* Hillsdale NJ: LEA.

Edward, A. L. (1990). Construct validity and social desirability. *American Psychologist, 45,* 287-289.

Golden, J. (2001). *Values arrangement list. Facilitator's reference manual.* Mount Laurel NJ: ORA.

Meglino, B.M. & Ravlin, E.C. (1998). Individual values in organizations: Concepts, controversies and research. *Journal of Management, 24,* 3, 351-389.

Meglino, B. M., Ravlin, E. C. & Adkins, C.L. (1989). A work values approach to corporate culture: A field test of the value congruence process and its relationship to individual outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 74,* 3, 424-432.

Marascuilo, L. A. & McSweeney, M. (1977). *Nonparametric and distribution-free methods for the social sciences.* Belmont CA: Brooks-Cole.

Reynolds, T.J. & Jolly, J. P. (1980). Measuring personal values: An evaluation of alternative methods. *Journal of Marketing Research, 17,* 4, 531-536.

Rokeach, M. (1973). *The nature of human values.* New York: Free Press.

Rokeach, M. (1979). From individual to institutional values: With special reference to the values of science. In M. Rokeach (Ed.), *Understanding human values* (pp. 47-70)New York: Free Press.

Singleton, A.F. & Chen, S (1996). The Medical Student Expectation Scale (MSES): A device for measuring students' expectations of each others' values and behaviours. *Medical Education, 30*, 3, 187-194.

Table 1

Values, Scale and Rank Means, t-values and Effect Sizes

Value	UG mean	Grad mean	t-value	η	η^2	UG mean Rank	Grad mean Rank	Mann-Whitney U Z-score	η	η^2
Accountability	4.0	4.4	-2.03	0.26	7%	31.3	30.7	-0.12	0.02	0%
Affection	4.3	4.3	-0.35	0.05	0%	31.2	30.8	-0.08	0.01	0%
Autonomy	4.0	4.2	-1.13	0.15	2%	33.4	28.4	-1.09	0.14	2%
Competency	3.7	4.2	-2.26	0.29	8%	36.0	25.5	-2.33	0.30*	9%
Courage	3.6	4.1	-2.11	0.27	7%	35.7	25.8	-2.16	0.28	8%
Courtesy	4.1	4.0	0.33	0.04	0%	27.6	34.8	-1.60	0.21	4%
Creativity	3.7	3.9	-0.55	0.07	1%	33.9	27.8	-1.34	0.18	3%
Discipline	4.0	4.0	0.00	0.00	0%	30.7	31.3	-0.12	0.02	0%
Drive	3.8	3.9	-0.06	0.01	0%	31.5	30.5	-0.22	0.03	0%
Fairness	3.9	4.2	-1.55	0.20	4%	31.8	30.1	-0.38	0.05	0%
Forgiveness	4.7	4.4	1.78	0.23	5%	30.1	32.0	-0.41	0.05	0%
Honesty	4.8	4.8	0.15	0.02	0%	28.3	33.9	-1.26	0.17	3%
Humor	4.2	4.3	-0.37	0.05	0%	31.7	30.3	-0.30	0.04	0%
Knowledge	3.9	4.3	-1.88	0.24	6%	36.3	25.1	-2.46	0.31*	10%
Loyalty	4.3	4.1	0.79	0.11	1%	26.6	35.8	-2.02	0.26	7%
Obedience	3.2	2.8	1.22	0.16	3%	25.4	37.2	-2.64	0.33*	11%
Order	3.3	2.9	1.26	0.17	3%	24.0	38.8	-3.28**	0.40*	16%
Reason	3.7	3.7	-0.18	0.02	0%	28.9	33.4	-0.99	0.13	2%
Service	4.1	3.7	1.29	0.17	3%	29.2	33.0	-0.85	0.11	1%
Tolerance	3.9	4.1	-0.92	0.12	1%	34.1	27.6	-1.41	0.19	3%

**p. <.0025
* Effect size exceeds .3

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

ERIC

TM035166

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Teaching Nonparametric Statistics Using Student Instrumental Values	
Author(s): Jonathan W. Anderson; Margaret Diddams	
Corporate Source: Seattle Pacific University	Publication Date: APA Conference 2002

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to each document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified documents, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Margaret Diddams

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

☒

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) and paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

☐

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

☐

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate these documents as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, → please

Signature: Margaret Diddams	Printed Name/Position/Title: Margaret Diddams Ph.D. Assoc. Professor	
Organization/Address: SPU 3307 Third Ave West Seattle WA 98119-1997	Telephone: 206-281-2179	FAX: 206-281-2695
	E-Mail Address: mdiddams@SPU.Edu	Date: 7/7/03

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of these documents from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of these documents. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

ERIC Counseling & Student Services
University of North Carolina at Greensboro
201 Ferguson Building
PO Box 26171
Greensboro, NC 27402-6171